REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 5, 2007, the Examiner took the following action: rejected claims 1-7, 18-22, and 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pyron (*Using Microsoft Project 98: Special Edition*) in view of Srinivasan (U.S. 5,548,508). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I.   *Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)*

Claims 1-7, 18-22, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pyron in view of Srinivasan. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections, and submit the claims are allowable over the cited references.

Pyron (*Using Microsoft Project 98: Special Edition*)

Pyron is a reference book that teaches aspects of Microsoft Project 98. Microsoft Project 98 is a software program that facilitates the completion of projection by enabling a user to schedule tasks and resources. (Page 2, Paragraphs 5-6).

Srinivasan (U.S. 5,548,508)

Srinivasan teaches an "auto multi-project server system". (Column 5, Lines 8-10). The system has capabilities for automatic data compilation, tracking and management, tracking multiple projects, resolve inter-project resource conflicts and communicate with users via electronic mail or fax mail. (Column 5, Lines 10-15).

- 12 -

<u>Claims 1-7</u>

Claim 2-7 depend from claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A method, comprising:

collaboratively performing a number of tasks by a plurality of parties,
wherein each task requires a series of collaborative actions;

recording the series of collaborative actions into a script database;

recording at least one issue and at least one issue resolution associated
with at least one of the tasks into an issue database, *wherein the at
least one issue and the at least one issue resolution are inputted by
a user;*

displaying a status of the series of collaborative actions taken in each
of the tasks, wherein the status of each task may be simultaneously
viewed by one or more of the plurality of parties, and wherein
displaying the status includes:

indicating two or more tasks including at least one of indicating
whether a part has not started, is in work, or has been completed;

indicating a last action completed within each of the tasks that are in
work;

displaying a total number of actions in each of the tasks;

displaying a percentage of the number of actions completed for each of
the tasks; and

for each task, displaying a bar graph having a shaded portion
corresponding to a percentage of the assigned actions completed
for each of the tasks. (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references to Pyron

and Srinivasan. Specifically, Pyron does not teach or suggest, "recording at least one issue and at

least one issue resolution associated with at least one of the tasks into an issue database, *wherein

the at least one issue and the at least one issue resolution are inputted by a user*," as recited in

claim 1. (emphasis added). Instead, Pyron teaches a "TeamAssign response form" that allows a

participant to provide comments and explanations about the participant's *acceptance or rejection*

of task assignments. (Page 584, Figure 18.27).

Moreover, the deficiencies of Pyron are not remedied by Srinivasan. Instead, Srinivasan

discloses an "Auto Multi-Project Server" that provides *"automatic* resolution of priority

conflicts," so that "a project leader does not have to constantly escalate issues up the

- 13 -

management hierarchy for resolution." (emphasis added). (Column 3, Lines 26-32). Srinivasan further discloses that its server is a software process that runs at fixed intervals to perform the task of "inter-project resource conflict resolution and allocation." (Column 5, Lines 44-50). In other words, Srinvasan discloses a server that automatically resolves priority and resource conflicts.

Accordingly, Srinivasan cannot teach or suggest, "recording at least one issue and at least one issue resolution associated with at least one of the tasks into an issue database, *wherein the at least one issue and the at least one issue resolution are inputted by a user*," as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added).

Thus, the cited references to Pyron and Srinivasan, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or fairly disclose the method recited in claim 1. Furthermore, because claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, they are also allowable over the cited references to Pyron and Srinivasan for at least the same reason claim 1 is allowable, as well as for additional limitations recited.

Claims 18-22

Claims 19-22 depend from claim 18. Claim 18, as amended, recites:

> 18.   A time management system for reducing the overall time required for more than one party to collaborate on a number of tasks, said system comprising:
> a script database;
> a first input component configured to receive a series of collaborative actions of one or more tasks;
> *a second input component configured to receive at least one issue and at least one issue resolution associated with at least one of the tasks;*
> a recording component configured to record the series of collaborative actions of one or more tasks into said script database, the one or more tasks being collaboratively performed by more than one party; and

- 14 -

a display component configured to display a status of the actions taken in each of the tasks to each party, including:

a first portion configured to display a total number of actions in each of the tasks;

a second portion configured to display a percentage of the number of actions completed for each of the tasks;

a third portion configured to indicate a last action completed within each of the tasks that are in work;

a fourth portion configured to display a total number of actions in each of the tasks; and

a fifth portion configured to display a percentage of the number of actions completed for each of the tasks, the fifth portion being further configured to display a bar graph having a shaded portion corresponding to a percentage of the assigned actions completed for each of the tasks. (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that claim 18 is patentable over the cited references to Pyron and Srinivasan. Specifically, Pyron does not teach or suggest, *"a second input component configured to receive at least one issue and at least one issue resolution associated with at least one of the tasks,"* as recited in claim 18. (emphasis added). Instead, Pyron teaches a "TeamAssign response form" that allows a participant to provide comments and explanations about the participant's *acceptance or rejection* of task assignments. (Page 584, Figure 18.27).

Moreover, the deficiencies of Pyron are not remedied by Srinivasan. Instead, Srinivasan discloses an "Auto Multi-Project Server" that provides *"automatic* resolution of priority conflicts," so that "a project leader does not have to constantly escalate issues up the management hierarchy for resolution." (emphasis added). (Column 3, Lines 26-32) Srinivasan further discloses that is server its a software process that runs at fixed intervals to perform the task of "inter-project resource conflict resolution and allocation." Column 5, Lines 44-50).

In other words, since Srinivasan discloses a server that automatically resolves priority and resource conflicts, it cannot disclose, *"a second input component configured to receive at least one issue and at least one issue resolution associated with at least one of the tasks,"* as recited in claim 18. (emphasis added).

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Thus, the cited references to Pyron and Srinivasan, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or fairly disclose the method recited in claim 18. Furthermore, because claims 19-22 depend from claim 18, they are also allowable over the cited references to Pyron and Srinivasan for at least the same reason claim 18 is allowable, as well as for additional limitations recited.

Claims 33-35

Claims 34-35 depend from claim 33. Claim 33, as amended, recites:

> 33. A computer readable medium containing instructions for controlling a computer system to perform a method, the method comprising:
> receiving a plurality of tasks that are collaboratively performed between parties via a first input interface, wherein each of said tasks includes a series of collaborative actions;
> *receiving least one issue and the at least one issue resolution associated with at least one of the tasks via a second input interface;*
> recording the series of collaborative actions into a script database;
> displaying a status of the actions taken in each of task including:
> > indicating two or more tasks including at least one of indicating whether a part has not started, is in work, or has been completed;
> > indicating a last action completed within each of the tasks that are in work;
> > displaying a total number of actions in each of the tasks; and
> > displaying a percentage of the number of actions completed for each of the tasks, including displaying a bar graph having a shaded portion corresponding to the percentage for each of the tasks; and
> providing immediate access to each party to allow viewing of the status of each task, thereby reducing the overall time required for the parties to perform the collaborative tasks. (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that claim 33 is patentable over the cited references to Pyron and Srinivasan. Specifically, applicants respectfully incorporate the argument presented above in response to the rejections of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by analogy, and assert

- 16 -

that the cited references to Pyron and Srinivasan does not teach or suggest, *"receiving least one issue and the at least one issue resolution associated with at least one of the tasks via a second input interface"* as recited in claim 33. Furthermore, because claims 34-35 depend from claim 33, they are also allowable over the cited references to Pyron and Srinivasan for at least the same reason claim 33 is allowable, as well as for additional limitations recited.

II.   New Claims

Claims 37-38 are newly added. Claim 37 depends from and applies additional limitations to claim 1, and claim 38 depends from and applies additional limitations to claim 18. Accordingly, claims 37-38 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies, as well for additional limitations recited in the claim.

- 17 -

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-7, 18-22, 33-35, and 37-38 are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _7-5-07_   By: _____

Elliott Y. Chen
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 58,293
Tel. (206) 315-7914

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

BO1-0327US

Disc. No. 00-348A